

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated June 15, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 24-38, 40-42, 44-48, and 50-54 remain pending in the application. The Applicant has canceled claims 9 and 39 without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 38, and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicant has amended the subject matter of now canceled dependent claim 9 to independent claim 1. The Applicant has also amended the subject matter of now canceled dependent claim 39 to independent claim 24. As such, independent claims 1 and 24, and claims 2-8, 11-15, 25-37, 40-42, 44-48, and 50-54 that depend therefrom respectfully, are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-8, 10-15, 24-38, 40-42, 44-48, and 50-54 and notification that these claims are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant notes that dependent claims 9 and 39 were recognized in the Office Action mailed 11/29/2006 to contain allowable subject matter, if respectively amended to independent claims 1 and 24, and that the current Office Action indicates the same. The present response adds the subject matter of claims 9 and 39 to independent claims 1 and 24, respectively, while also removing subject matter added to independent claims 1 and 24 since the mailing of the 11/29/2006 Office Action. The removed subject matter has been amended to dependent claims 10 and 38. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that the language of the claims speaks for itself in defining the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the Applicant's claimed subject matter, nor what portions of the claims are specifically not taught or suggested by the prior art. The pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" in accordance with MPEP § 2111.

Furthermore, the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterization of the prior art, including what prior art is applicable and what the prior art teaches or suggests. The Examiner's characterizations of the art of record should not have the effect of limiting the breadth of coverage afforded the Applicant's allowed claims.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (GUID.038US01) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700 ext. 18

Date: September 14, 2007

By:



Paul Sherburne  
Reg. No. 57,843